

REMARKS

Claims 9–21 are pending in the application. These claims were rejected as follows:

Claims / Section	35 U.S.C. Sec.	References / Notes
13, 16	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Typographical errors
9–12 & 14–16	§102(b) Anticipation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kano, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,741,993).
13 & 17–20	§103(a) Obviousness	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kano, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,741,993); and• Leblans, et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0066972).
21	§103(a) Obviousness	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kano, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,741,993);• Leblans, et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0066972); and• Dopper (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0055653).

5 Applicants have amended independent claims 9 and 17 to more specifically define the claimed subject matter, and have amended dependent claims 13 and 16 to correct typographical errors.

Applicants' use of reference characters below is for illustrative purposes only and is not intended to be limiting in nature unless explicitly indicated.

10 **OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS 13 AND 16**

1. The typographical errors in claims 13 and 16 have been corrected in accordance with the Examiner's recommendations.

15 In the OA, on p. 2, the Examiner noted two typographical errors in the claims and proposed suggested corrections. Applicants have amended the claims to include the suggestions by the Examiner and thank the Examiner for pointing these out. Withdrawal of the objections to the claims is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102(b), CLAIMS 9–12 & 14–16 ANTICIPATION BY KANO

2. *Independent claim 9 has been amended to include the limitation that the protective layer is made of a polymer with a one-piece layer structure, which is not taught by Kano.*

5 Applicants have amended independent claim 9 to include the limitation that the protective layer is made of a polymer with a one-piece layer structure. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph 0018 of the Substitute Specification.

10 The disclosure of a protective layer made of a polymer with a one-piece layer structure cannot be found in the teaching of Kano. Kano teaches, rather, a composite protective (13a, 13b, see 3:40–47). Kano further teaches a plurality of layers (3:46–47, 61–64). Such a disclosure does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 9, as amended.

15 Based on the amendment to independent claim 9, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection be withdrawn from the application.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a), CLAIMS 13 & 17–21 OBVIOUSNESS OVER KANO IN VIEW OF
LEBLANS AND DOPPER**

20 3. *Independent claims 9 and 17 have been amended to include the limitation that the protective layer is made of a polymer with a one-piece layer structure, which is not taught by any combination of Kano, Leblans, and Dopper.*

 Applicants have amended independent claims 9 and 17 to include the limitation that the protective layer is made of a polymer with a one-piece layer structure. For reasons noted above, Kano does not provide a teaching or suggestion of the independent claims, as amended, of the application.

25 Furthermore, Leblans teaches a two-layer structure (paragraph 0015) and therefore does not teach or suggest a polymer with a one-piece layer structures that serves as a protective layer.

The Examiner cites Dopper for its disclosure of elements related to elements of dependent claim 21—Dopper does not further teach or suggest the limitations of the amended independent claims.

For these reasons, and based on the amendments to independent claims 5 9 and 17, Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the independent claims serve to distinguish over the art of record and request that the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection be withdrawn from the application.

CONCLUSION

Inasmuch as each of the objections have been overcome by the 10 amendments, and all of the Examiner's suggestions and requirements have been satisfied, it is respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered, the rejections be withdrawn and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

15

/Mark Bergner/ (Reg. No. 45,877)

20

Mark Bergner
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
PATENT DEPARTMENT
6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6473
(312) 258-5779
Attorney for Applicants
Customer Number 26574

25